

REMARKS

Responsive to the Office Action mailed September 28, 2007, Applicant provides the following. Claims 1-30 have been amended without adding new matter. Thirty (30) claims remain pending in the application: Claims 1-30. Reconsideration of claims 1-30 in view of the amendments above and remarks below is respectfully requested.

By way of this amendment, Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain any outstanding issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned at (949) 932-3181 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Claim Objections

1. Claim 12 stands objected to for an informality. Per the Examiner's recommendation, claim 12 has been amended to depend from claim 11, thus, it is respectfully submitted that the objection of claim 12 is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §101

2. Claims 21-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 21-30 have been amended to recite a computer readable medium. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 21-30 is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

3. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-15, 17-18, 20-25, 27-28 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,980,702 (Michiie et al.).

Michiie teaches an image processing apparatus capable of reading the entire designated data made up of a plurality of pages and stored in an image

storing means or only desired part of the entire image data (Michiie, column 2, lines 14-18). The apparatus has a video memory 87 that “allows image data to be written to, e.g., an area 1 and allows image data to be read out of an area 2 at the same time” (col. 6, lines 24-32). Michiie also teaches transferring the image data read out of the image data to an operation panel 60 (col. 6, lines 33-35).

Regarding claim 1, Michiie does not teach at least “a reading control unit configured to perform a successive reading operation, wherein, in the successive reading operation, plural sets of document sheets divided from a series of document sheets are independently read by the image reading unit, and image data corresponding to the read plural sets of document sheets is stored in the image storage unit as a series of image data corresponding to the series of document sheets; and a control unit configured to enable the display unit to display image data corresponding to the read image data after reading each set of document sheets in the successive reading operation” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1.

While Michiie does teach an apparatus that can read a desired portion (e.g., a set) of image data (e.g., a series of document sheets) that is already stored in memory and transfer the desired portion to an operation panel, Michiie does not teach an apparatus configured to perform a successive reading operation to read plural sets of document sheets divided from a series of document sheets and display image data corresponding to the read image data after reading each set of document sheets in the successive reading operation.

MPEP 2131 states “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” Michiie does not teach at least “a reading control unit configured to perform a successive reading operation, wherein, in the successive reading operation, plural sets of document sheets divided from a series of document sheets are independently read by the image reading unit, and image data corresponding to the read plural sets of document sheets is stored in the image storage unit as a series of image data corresponding to the series of document sheets; and a control unit configured to enable the display unit to

display image data corresponding to the read image data after reading each set of document sheets in the successive reading operation," as recited in claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 1 is overcome and should be withdrawn. Claims 2-10 are dependent from claim 1, thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 2-10 is overcome and should be withdrawn at least due to their dependency on claim 1.

Claim 11 has been amended substantially as claim 1 has been amended, thus, the comments above regarding claim 1 are also applicable to claim 11. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 11 is overcome and should be withdrawn. Claims 12-30 are dependent from claim 11, thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 12-30 is overcome and should be withdrawn at least due to their dependency on claim 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

4. Claims 6, 9, 16, 19, 26 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Michiie in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,212,307 (Kanda).

Claims 6 and 9 and claims 16, 19, 26 and 29 depend on claims 1 and 11, respectively, which have been shown above not to be anticipated by Michiie. Kanda provides no further teaching regarding the invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 11. Therefore, the proposed combination of Michiie and Kanda does not render obvious the invention recited in claims 1 or 11. Thus, at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 11, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 6, 9, 16, 19, 26 and 29 is overcome and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 502456.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

January 28, 2008

/casey r. huffmire/

Date

Casey R. Huffmire, Reg. No. 60,085
Patent Agent for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731

Telephone: 949-932-3181
Fax: 949-932-3560